



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Combined Committee Meeting

Meeting Summary

March 26, 2002
Sheraton Augusta Hotel
Augusta, GA

The following were in attendance at the March 26, 2002, Combined Committee meeting of the Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held at the Sheraton Hotel in Augusta, Ga.

CAB Members

David Adcock
Meryl Alalof
Judy Barnett
Ann Dalton
Gerald Devitt
Mel Galin
Ken Goad
Vera Barnes Jordan
William Lawrence
J.G. Long
Jimmy Mackey
Dorene Richardson
Lola Richardson
Murray Riley
Jean Sulc
Wade Waters
Gloria Williams-Way
Bill Willoughby

Stakeholders

Gerard Voos
Brandon Haddock
Lynn Waishwell
Tiajuana Cochnauer
David Watkins
Emily Dry
Bill McDonell
Richard Herold
Karen Patterson
Ed Wannemacher

Regulators

Chuck Gorman, SCDHEC
Don Siron, SCDHEC
Todd Davis, DNFSB

DOE/Contractors

Jessie Roberson, DOE
Greg Rudy, DOE
Tom Heenan, DOE
Becky Craft, DOE
George Mishra, DOE
Shayne Farrell, DOE
Jim Buice, DOE
Charlie Anderson, DOE
Roy Schepens, DOE
Drew Grainger, DOE
Ray Hannah, DOE
Dawn Gillas, DOE
Bob Pedde, WSRC
Dave Amerine, WSRC
Teresa Haas, WSRC
Mike Nelson, WSRC
Sonny Goldston, WSRC
Ed McNamee, BSRI
Dawn Haygood, WSRC
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC
Jim Moore, WSRC
Paul Sauerborn, WSRC
Helen Villasor, WSRC
Kelly Way, WSRC

Remarks by Assistant Secretary Jessie Roberson

Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management Jessie Roberson addressed the SRS CAB for the first half-hour of the combined committee meeting. She applauded the Board for its efforts noting that she does track its comments and recommendations and invited the Board to draw her attention if necessary.

She commented that she was visiting SRS this week to hear proposals for the Cleanup Reform Appropriation (CRA). She discussed her background and the fact that she had worked at SRS for more than ten years and therefore was very familiar with site operations. She briefly discussed the EM Top-to-Bottom review describing it as a framework to focus on accelerated cleanup. Mr. Roberson then answered CAB members questions regarding Environmental Restoration funding, the CRA process, funding allocated to Hanford, Science & Technology funding, regulatory and Congressional response to the CRA.

Environmental Restoration Committee Report

Update on the Closure of the Old Solvent Tanks

Ed McNamee stated that the grouting of the Old Solvent Tanks (OST) continues on schedule. Mr. McNamee explained that the goals of this project is to stabilize free liquids in the 22 tanks (approximately 6000 gallons) and fill the tanks with grout to provide structural stability. Mr. McNamee stated that the grouting process includes the following six steps that will be repeated for each tank:

1. Establish controlled area around the tank
2. Install scaffold for riser support
3. Install grout injection equipment
4. Grout using from 1 to 5 lifts
5. Decon grout area around tank
6. Demobilize

Mr. McNamee presented the closure progress to date as:

- Remedial action start – 9/17/01
- Completed field demonstration – 10/25/01
- Completed grouting first tank – 11/15/01
- Completed grouting 7th tank – 3/14/02

With the remaining schedule:

- Complete all dual riser tanks – 9/30/02
- Complete all tanks – 2/28/03
- Remedial action complete – 3/30/03
- Submit Post-Construction report – 6/26/03

David Adcock asked how you could assure thorough mixing of the grout in the tank. Mr. McNamee stated that the formulation of the grout and the use of dry grout to absorb the remaining liquid in the tank are followed very carefully. Bill Willoughby inquired if there was any way to determine the amount of shrinkage of the grout in the tanks. Mr. McNamee stated that the formulation of the grout prevents shrinkage.

Use of the Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground as a Consolidation Unit

Ed McNamee stated the remedial strategy is to combine remediation of several inactive operable units into a single action, called the General Separations Area Consolidation Unit (GSACU). Also, to issue an update to the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) that lists GSACU as an Operable Unit with a new milestone schedule.

Mr. McNamee stated that the inactive waste sites are as follows:

1. Warner's Pond
 - The site was contaminated by highly radioactive effluent spills in 1967 and 1969
 - Primary contaminant is Cesium 137
 - Established volume of soil to be removed is 11,000 cubic yards, which includes a portion of H-Area inactive process sewer line
2. HP-52 Ponds
 - Site contaminated by highly radioactive effluent spills in 1967 and 1969
 - Primary contaminant is Cesium 137
 - Estimated volume of soil to be removed is 12,500 cubic yards
3. H-Area Retention Basin
 - Operated from 1955 to 1972 to receive wastewater from the canyon facilities and H-Area Tank Farm
 - Primary contaminant is Cesium 137 and Strontium 90
 - Estimated volume of soil to be removed is 10,000 cubic yards

Mr. McNamee informed the meeting attendees that the scope of the remedial action is as follows:

- Close the 22 ORWBG old solvent tanks (being grouted in-place under an Interim ROD)
- Remove and consolidate highly contaminated soils and material from HRB, WP, and HP-52 and place them at pre-determined locations within the ORWBG
- Backfill and cover the excavated areas of HRB, WP and HP-52
- Upon completion of the consolidation activities, an engineered cover system will be installed over the entire ORWBG, including its 22 old solvent tanks
- Before the loss of institutional controls, install intruder barrier systems over persistent 'hot spots'
- All units will be maintained under institutional control

Mr. McNamee stressed the following benefits to this action:

- Avoided costly investigations and risk assessment of ORWBG
- Used burial records, process history and interviews
- Used interim action to close tanks in place
- Closing the highest risk OU's in the ER Program
- Accelerates the remediation of several units under a single action
- Avoids \$150 million in streamlining costs
- Saves \$3.6 million by streamlining the regulatory decision-making process

Murray Riley asked if the soils were to be cleaned before placing into the burial ground, to which the answer was no. The soils will be placed into the burial ground over the 22 grouted tanks and then a final engineered cap will be placed over the top to minimize infiltration of water.

Strategic & Long Term Issues Committee Report

The topics discussed were the Site planning and budget process/tools overview, Savannah River Site (SRS) Integrated Priority List development process, finalized schedule for stakeholder involvement in the budget process and the National Environmental Protection Act / Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act public involvement process.

Site Planning and Budget Process/Tools Overview

Mike Nelson, WSRC, gave an overview of the site planning and budget process, explaining the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), the DOE Strategic Management System, and how SRS develops their plans and budget. Planning fundamentals start with the end in mind, meaning performance results. These results must be measurable. Success begins with strategic planning. From

the Strategic Plan down, all plans must be integrated and linked. The lower you go in the planning structure, the more detailed the plans.

The GPRA applies to all federal agencies and requires three deliverables to Congress: A Strategic Plan, an Annual Performance Plan and an Annual Performance Report. The focus is on results. The DOE Strategic Management System has four sections: Budget formation, budget execution, evaluation and planning. There are many other laws and regulations that apply also.

Mr. Nelson reviewed the SRS Planning and Executive Boards that control and produce the plans for SRS. A Management Control System Process Flow Diagram was used to help show the interaction and integration of the many plans at SRS.

The layer of plans reviewed by Mr. Nelson were the DOE Strategic Plan, the SRS Strategic Plan, the SRS Long Range Comprehensive Plan, the many site program and mission plans and then the project baselines. These are all integrated. The SRS Strategic Plan establishes the SRS mission, vision, goals and objectives (performance results). The Comprehensive Plan directs the implementation of the SRS Strategic Plan. It insures integration across the site and communication with internal and external stakeholders. The SRS Program and Mission Plans provide the tactical information and program specific guidance.

Mr. Nelson explained that while the site works on the budget from the bottom up, DOE-HQ gives guidance and direction from the top down. The difference between the two is generally a funding gap. The site focuses on the difference by utilizing the Integrated Priority List (IPL), productivity and cost effectiveness programs and new technology. The site works on three budgets at a time: the current 2002 budget, the FY 2003 and FY 2004 budget.

During discussion, there were several questions or action items that need responses.

- Mr. Mackey requested that in relation to performance results for 2001, he be supplied information on any programs that the site didn't meet or fell short on.
- Mr. Mackey requested that the CAB see the make plan summaries in the change control process.

Savannah River Site Integrated Priority List (IPL) Development Process

Shayne Farrell, DOE, stated that the current IPL process has been used for the last six years. In evaluating that process, there were some identified issues. They were the inability to track changes from year to year, a single year delay in funding versus multi-year, and risk reduction was absent. A Prioritization Process Team was put together to solve the issues.

Top management, subject matter experts and stakeholders have reviewed the proposed process. The proposed process has three parts: Risk Reduction Score, Business Considerations Score and Management and Strategic Considerations. The proposed process used Expert Choice software to weight paired comparisons. The criteria are given weights with from four to seven consequences per criterion. The consequence scores range from 0 to 100. Once the scores are computed, the scores will remain with that particular IPL project until the next time it is re-evaluated. Therefore you will be able to track changes from year to year. It is expected that every three to five years, the IPL project will be re-scored. It is believed this tool will help the site better prioritize, communicate and accomplish the site work.

During discussions, there were several action items that need responses.

- Mr. Mackey requested that the priority list from FY03 and FY04 be given to the CAB so they can compare the lists based on the old criteria (FY03) and the new criteria (FY04).

- Wade Waters suggested that the CAB for educational purposes be walked through the scoring process with the new criteria at some future meeting.

Finalized Schedule for Stakeholder Involvement in the Budget Process

Jim Buice, DOE, in response to CAB Recommendation 149, reviewed a strawman budget schedule that would give the stakeholders an opportunity to be involved in the budget process earlier. He reviewed some guiding principles on the budget process. The Office of Management and Budget policy is that "Internal deliberations regarding the various issues and options that are considered in the process leading to the President's decisions should remain a matter of internal record." Since programmatic cleanup plans drive the budget request, cleanup plans, activities and associated priorities should be made through the CAB Committees. Flexibility in the schedule needs to be maintained.

Mr. Buice reviewed the typical DOE budget cycle and presented a schedule for stakeholder involvement into the SRS budget process. There were no comments on the schedule.

National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) / Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Public Involvement

Drew Grainger, DOE, stated that DOE Order 451.1.B and advice from the Council on Environmental Quality and the Department of Justice caused an integration of NEPA and CERCLA integration. It will result in the broad use of functionally equivalent processes in the long run being cost effective. In 1997, SRS developed and implemented integration guidance and trained the staff. A Values Impact Assessment (VIA) was developed by SRS to be used in the process. An Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) has been used at other sites and is now being used at SRS.

The advantages to this integration are that it satisfies NEPA and CERCLA requirements, the NEPA requirements are completed early in the process, it uses the CERCLA public involvement process, it eliminates redundant sampling and impacts analysis, used the more conservative and functionally equivalent CERCLA human health risk scenarios and reduces cost and time. Mr. Grainger explained those items from NEPA that are not included in the integration process.

Mr. Grainger gave information on both the VIA and EE/CA. Near future VIAs are General Separations Area Consolidated Unit and TNX Discharge Gully. Completed VIAs are the remediation of the Chemical, Metals, and Pesticides Pits Operable Unit and remediation of the TNX-Area Operable Unit.

Nuclear Materials Committee Report

Ken Goad, NM Committee Chair, introduced Todd Davis as one of the DNFSB representatives assigned to SRS. Goad stated that Davis had made a presentation during the March 14 NM meeting and addressed several issues that would be of interest to all CAB members. He also stated that as a result of that presentation and a recent DNFSB letter, the April NM Committee meeting would focus on issues associated with H-Canyon tank space management and the storage of Depleted Uranium. He encouraged all interested persons to attend that meeting in Savannah, GA on April 22, 2002.

DNFSB Presentation on Savannah River Site Nuclear Material Stabilization Activities

Todd Davis thanked the CAB for the opportunity to speak to them and began his presentation with an overview of the establishment, organization, and the functions and powers of the DNFSB. As experts in nuclear safety, he explained the DNFSB uses specific recommendations, letters, and reports as tools to make changes when warranted. As examples, he cited a recently issued letter identifying issues associated with the storage of Depleted Uranium at SRS and another relating to Salt Disposition. Related

questions were answered and web sites were identified for those interested in obtaining additional information on the DNFSB as well as copies of the referenced letters.

Davis stated that DNFSB concerns in regards to material stabilization activities throughout the DOE Complex including SRS, resulted in the issuing of Recommendation 1994-1. Failure to make adequate progress prompted Recommendation 2000-1. While he acknowledged that the DNFSB has been critical of past delays in material stabilization activities, he believes there has been significant progress made since 1994. The DNFSB, at least conceptually, is in agreement with the proposed SRS implementation plan for stabilization activities, which is in revision but expected soon. He said progress has been demonstrated in the last few years through the restart of several facilities as well as the startup of the HB-Line Phase II oxide process. Other positive steps under construction include the 3013 packaging project in FB-Line and the Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Blend Down project in H-Canyon. He stated a potential problem with tank space is associated with the H-Canyon project. This project is a very important one for the site and is being watched very closely.

As to the current status of F-Canyon, Davis said the DNFSB had concerns about DOE's plans for long-term chemical separations activities which were detailed in a letter last May. At that time, it was the DNFSB's position that F-Canyon would be needed for future chemical processing. Earlier this year, DOE responded that the F-Canyon PUREX process will not be used for plutonium disposition purposes. As a result, F-Canyon suspension plans are ongoing. Davis said the DNFSB has recently issued a second letter to DOE questioning the wisdom of this course of action. The DNFSB has communicated to DOE that having both H and F-Canyon available is still appropriate and would provide flexibility and a means to achieve stabilization goals sooner with a proven methodology. According to Davis, there continues to be some surplus material identified in the DOE complex and F-Canyon could be a viable option for disposition. He answered related questions and stated that DOE has been given 60 days to respond to the March 21, 2002 letter from the Chairman of the DNFSB.

Davis concluded his presentation with a short discussion on spent nuclear fuel. He said the DNFSB's concern relating to the problems associated with the development of new technologies for the stabilization of nuclear materials remains unchanged since 1999. He stated that while the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) had identified the Melt and Dilute technology as the preferred alternatives for treating most of the aluminum based spent nuclear fuel, it is not currently funded. The DNFSB supports utilizing existing facility capabilities (i.e., H-Canyon) to stabilize spent nuclear fuel while other disposition options are developed.

Waste Management Committee Report

In his opening remarks, Bill Willoughby, Waste Management Committee (WMC) chair said that the *Solid Waste Division 2001 Annual Report* had been distributed to CAB members at today's meeting. Mr. Willoughby noted that the Waste Management Committee would meet on April 16, 5:00 p.m., at the Aiken Federal Building to discuss High Level Waste (HLW) topics. Mr. Willoughby then announced that because the issue of accelerating the Ship to WIPP program had become a priority to the WMC, the March 26 agenda had been changed to include a TRU waste presentation. Mr. Willoughby also added that the agenda for the April CAB meeting would include presentations and draft motions on both CIF/PUREX, and Accelerating the TRU Ship to WIPP programs.

Consolidated Incineration Facility Focus Group Update

Ray Hannah, DOE Program Manager said that for the benefit of the new CAB members, he would provide a background on the CIF issue before proceeding with an update on the status of CIF and the work of the CIF Focus Group as it follows work on the disposition of legacy PUREX waste.

Explaining that CIF was a treatment option for PUREX, Mr. Hannah said the facility treated 5,000 gallons of the waste prior to its suspension in November 2000. To date, 37,700 gallons remain in inventory at

SRS. Mr. Hannah said that the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) issued a permit modification that placed CIF in a suspension mode, and required that by April 1, 2002, the site would make a decision to either pursue alternative treatment options for PUREX and close CIF by November 2002, or restart CIF. Then, on July 24, 2001, the SRS CAB recommended that DOE-SR develop a plan that would allow CIF to remain as a viable option until an alternative treatment technology is demonstrated for site PUREX waste. Mr. Hannah emphasized that CAB Recommendation 141 was a good recommendation and made a lot of sense since it provided SRS with a fallback position. Mr. Hannah said SRS listened to the CAB and as a result, on January 2, 2002, SRS requested a permit modification from SCDHEC that would extend the CIF closure date.

Under the conditions of the permit modification, if SRS decides to pursue an alternative, annual progress reports would be submitted and an extension of CIF's closure would be requested. If within 45 days, SCDHEC denied the extension request, then SRS would be compelled to commence CIF closure. Mr. Hannah noted that the permit modification also contained a request to delete the monitoring requirements for the condensate tanks. Mr. Hannah said that the regulators received only one comment during the public comment period and it had come from the SRS CAB Waste Management Committee. In terms of the current status, Mr. Hannah said that on March 19, 2002, SRS received approval of the CIF permit modification request.

Mr. Hannah explained that the CIF Focus Group had recently been briefed on the PUREX Waste Alternative Treatment Report and the WSRC recommendation made to DOE, which is to pursue an alternative treatment and delay CIF closure until the alternative treatment is demonstrated (defined as treating ten percent of the organic phase).

Mr. Hannah said that the path forward now is for DOE to accept WSRC's recommendation, notify SCDHEC by April 1, 2002 of its decision to pursue PUREX alternative treatment, and not restart CIF. In addition, SRS will continue to further develop stabilization as the treatment alternative. For example, Mr. Hannah said that by the end of 2002, some of the continuing work would include selecting the media that will be used for the stabilization process and to scale up testing.

In closing, Mr. Hannah emphasized that this has been a real success story, and has reached a point now that is completely different from two years ago when CIF was first placed in a suspension mode. Noting that while this decision had been a difficult one to reach, it has also been a strong collaboration effort among DOE, WSRC, and SCDHEC. Mr. Hannah expressed his extreme appreciation to all parties involved in the process. Mr. Hannah also extended his special thanks to the CAB and the CIF Focus Group for working close on the issue and for helping to achieve a positive outcome.

SRS Transuranic Waste Shipment to WIPP

Before opening his presentation, Sonny Goldston asked if there were any questions on the *Solid Waste Division 2001 Annual Report*. Noting that there was also an attached letter from Dr. W. S. J. Kelly, Vice President and General Manager of the Solid Waste Division (SWD), Mr. Goldston said that the report contained information relative to SWD's accomplishments throughout the year. Mr. Goldston said he hoped the CAB members would enjoy reading the report and asked that he be provided with any feedback on how the report can be improved.

Mr. Goldston began his presentation by first introducing Virgil Sauls, DOE Manager of Waste Operations Division, and Bert Crapse, DOE – TRU Program Manager. Then, Mr. Goldston explained that Bill Willoughby and Jerry Devitt had toured the Solid Waste Division on March 14, 2002 and during their visit, had an opportunity to learn that SRS was facing delays in its ability to complete its baseline of TRU waste shipments of 12 TRU shipment per year to WIPP through 2014. Mr. Goldston explained that Messrs. Willoughby and Devitt believed it would be a good idea to present the situation to the Waste Management Committee and he was here today to do precisely as they had requested.

Noting that DOE-SR and DOE Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO) negotiated accelerating SRS shipments in exchange for receipt of Mound Site (approximately 300 cubic meters) TRU waste, Mr. Goldston said SCDHEC agreed to two drums of SRS waste to be shipped in exchange for each Mound drum-equivalent received. Mr. Goldston clarified that this ratio of two to one agreement is for drums that are shipped over and above the baseline 12 shipments per year that have already been planned.

Explaining that CBFO deployed a mobile characterization vendor to augment SRS characterization and shipping capacity, Mr. Goldston said that 80 shipments were planned in fiscal year 2002. This included the 12 baseline shipments and 68 shipments to account for the ratio of two to one receipt of Mound waste. To date, approximately 300 drums have been physically characterized and at this current rate, there are expectations to support the 80 shipments in fiscal year 2002.

Mr. Goldston said that the issue at hand is that WIPP is currently limited to approximately 25 shipments per week because of restrictions for funding for truck drivers, TRUPACT containers, and disposal operations. In addition, DOE-HQ has made commitments to Rocky Flats and Idaho for virtually all shipping capacity in fiscal year 2002. While SRS has been notified to plan on 12 shipments, CBFO is tentatively planning the SRS shipping campaign in fiscal year 2003 to achieve the Mound objective.

Mr. Goldston said by way of an update, SRS was just notified that Idaho has been experiencing delays in the preparation of its TRU waste shipments to WIPP; therefore, one TRUPACT II (which holds three shipping containers) would be allotted to SRS to make one shipment. However, in response to a question as to whether the delays would continue and more TRUPACT IIs would be made available, Mr. Goldston replied that he was uncertain if the pattern would continue. In response to a question regarding a Department of Transportation (DOT) Exemption for shipment of transuranic waste in ATMX/OHGX railcars from Mound only until May 2002, Mr. Goldston said that the railcar certification was approved and the license had been extended.

Mr. Goldston said characterization rates achieved with the mobile vendor support demonstrates that SRS could accelerate shipments of all TRU legacy waste (approximately 11,000 cubic meters in storage). Mr. Goldston then referred briefly to the Cleanup Reform Appropriation Proposal initiative, which is to expedite TRU waste shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Mr. Goldston said that the CAB first heard about this initiative at the CAB Combined Committee meeting on February 26, 2002. In order to reduce risk, that portion of SRS's request would accelerate shipment of legacy from 2034 to 2015, and the Mound agreement could serve as precedent for SRS supporting TRU deinventory at other DOE Small Quantity Sites (approximately 700 cubic meters). Using a chart to forecast the acceleration of disposal of legacy TRU waste, Mr. Goldston said there are many benefits. For example, SRS would achieve risk reduction 19 years ahead of baseline; save taxpayer dollars; support complex-wide closure activities, and demonstrate commitment to exit strategy for TRU waste.

In conclusion, Mr. Goldston said the availability of TRUPACT II shipping containers is limiting near-term SRS shipments to WIPP. The entire TRU program could be accelerated though additional funding under the Contract Reform Initiative and would address the CAB's concern about accelerating high activity TRU shipments to WIPP.

Several questions followed Mr. Goldston's presentation. For example, Wade Waters asked that if more TRUPACT IIs were available would the concern about making the shipments for fiscal year 2002 be alleviated. Mr. Goldston said the major concern now is that the available TRUPACT IIs are committed to Rocky Flats and Idaho and it takes time to build new ones. In response to a question from Karen Patterson, Mr. Goldston said that there have been no formal talks yet with the Governor of South Carolina about bringing more waste to SRS. Mel Galin said that the baseline schedule does not present appropriate planning by DOE to promise Rocky Flats availability of TRUPACTs when Mound is trying to close. Mr. Galin added that it still looks like a nine to ten month delay, but if there is an opportunity to speed things up, then the proposal is a good one for the Top to Bottom Review. Mr. Galin said he wasn't aware that anyone was pushing toward this initiative; however, Mr. Goldston said that Mr. Willoughby picked up on it during his visit to the site on March 14 and believed the CAB should hear about it in more

detail. Hence, the reason why the agenda was changed to include the presentation. Mr. Galin added that it would appear to him that the CAB is all for helping to speed things up and would not want to see it slow down. Mr. Galin asked that Mr. Goldston come back to the CAB to let members know if there is a problem. Bill Willoughby noted that the WMC was already working on a draft motion on the issue and would be presented at the April 23 CAB meeting.

Handouts of the meeting may be obtained by calling 1-800-249-8155.